IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SIRI JAGAN

THURSDAY, THE 24TH MAY 2007 / 3RD JYAISHTA 1929

WP(C).No. 15143 of 2007(C)

PETITIONER:

SRI.P.I.THAJUDEEN,REVATHY PLAZA PALACKAL
PERANDOOR ROAD,KALOOR,
ERNAKULAM.

BY ADV. SRI.K.I.MAYANKUTTY MATHER
SMT.S.AMINA

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. GOVERNMENT OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY TO FOOD AND
CIVIL SUPPLIES,SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE COMMISSIONER CIVIL SUPPLIES,
TRIVANDRUM.

3. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
ERNAKULAM.

4. THE DISTRICT SUPPLY OFFICER,
ERNAKULAM.

5. THE TALUK SUPPLY OFFICER,
KANAYANNUR TALUK,
ERNAKULAM.

6. SRI.JITHIN JOY,
ALAPPAT HOUSE,
CHANGAMPUZHA NAGAR,
EDAPALLY.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. I.V. PROMOD
SRI. K. J. KURIACHAN – FOR R6.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 24/05/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

S.SIRI JAGAN,J

==========

R.P.No.645 of 2007

in

W.P.(C).No.15143 of 2007

==========

Dated this the 23rd day of July 2007

ORDER

The state has filed a review petition for review of the portion of the judgment which directs that till Ext.P9 stay application is considered and orders passed thereon, the second respondent shall not implement Ext.P8 order. The learned counsel for the petitioner brings to my attention that the sixth respondent in the present review petition had filed an appeal against the judgment, which is sought to be reviewed, in which the very same contention was raised which was disposed of, as follows:

> "Before considering the stay petition if Ext.P8 order is implemented, the petitioner will be put to irreparable loss which cannot be compensated in terms of the money and therefore, the learned Single Judge has only directed the authorities to keep Ext.P8 order in abeyance till the stay petition filed by the petitioner before the State Government along with his revision petition is decided one way or the other. In our opinion, the order passed by the learned Single Judge in no way affects the interests of any one of the parties to this proceedings. Therefore, the writ appeal requires to be rejected and it is rejected."

Since the judgment has been confirmed in writ appeal, there is no scope for reviewing the judgment. Accordingly, the review petition is dismissed.

S.SIRI JAGAN, JUDGE

dvs